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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Motivation | A study the relationship between individual motivation and level of team development | The effect of congruence of leadership behaviors on motivation, commitment, and satisfaction of college tennis players | Working conditions in projects: perceptions of stress and motivation among project team members and project managers |
| RESEARCH OBJECTIVE | 1. The purpose of this study is to investigate how membership in a high-performing team impacts the individual motivation of a team member. 2. Determining the most significant motivators and how an organization can use these to best maintain a high level of individual motivation within a worker that belongs to one or several high-performing teams. | 1. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of congruence of leadership behaviors on motivation, commitment, and satisfaction of college tennis players. 2. The proposed study could have a profound impact on how tennis is taught across the world in a variety of individual and group settings. | 1. The purpose of this article is to investigate what type of incidents projects encounter and how project managers’ and team members’ perceptions of motivation and stress are affected by these incidents. |
| PROBLEM STATEMENT | The question that arises is how individual motivational factors are impacted as the team moves closer to high performance and does belonging to a high-performance team truly inspire a higher level of individual performance | The purpose of this study is to investigate the potential positive relationships between the congruence of preferred and perceived leadership behaviors with motivation, commitment, and satisfaction of college tennis players. | How do project managers and project team members perceive incidents that the typical project encounters? |
| SCOPE   1. WHERE 2. WHEN 3. WHO | Who-participating organizations from afar for many years, having been employed in various capacities within the industry for more than 25 years.  Where-organizations in United States.  When-March 2008. | Who-collegiate tennis players from all NCAA division levels (I, II, and III).  Where- Sport education University of USA  When-Fall Semester, 2004 | Who-project managers’ and team members ’IT-consulting and telecommunication industries  Where-IT-consulting and telecommunication  industries  When-19 December 2001; |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | Extensive research has been conducted on the topics of motivation and work environments since the coming of the Industrial Revolution. One of the most often utilized methods of encouraging effective and efficient results has been the use of  Teamwork, and it is often taken for granted that the use of teams results in more highly motivated employees. | The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature pertaining to the variables in this study. The review is presented in four sections which include: (a) Leadership; (b) Motivation; (c) Commitment; (d) Satisfaction. | Work motivation is a term commonly used by both practitioners and researchers to explain the intensity, direction, and persistence of individuals towards work. Motivation could be viewed as a personal inner state. Defines work motivation as ‘‘a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual’s being to initiate work-related behaviours, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and  duration’’ |
| MEHTODOLOGY:   1. DATA COLLECTION 2. DATA ANALYSIS | 1. A cross-sectional survey design. 2. Quantitative and qualitative techniques 3. The data gathering techniques 4. The traditional methods of collecting data in a qualitative design include open-ended observations, interviews, and document review, but are rapidly expanding to include sources such as sounds, e-mails, scrapbooks. 5. The first instrument, the Motivation Sources Inventory (MSI), developed by Barbuto and Scholl (1998), was used to identify sources of motivation. 6. The second instrument used in this survey, the Team Performance Survey, developed by Peters (1997), is a questionnaire designed to assess the level of team development | 1. Using responses from 178 Little League athletes. 2. The survey questions. 3. Internet surveys along with suggestions for possible solutions. 4. A demographic questionnaire. 5. Participant was asked to complete 121 questions although 181 responses will be required for full completion of the survey. 6. Confirmatory factor analyses were performed on each scale to assess an appropriate fit of the data to the identified model factors. | This study rests upon data from a combination of  semi-structured and un-structured interviews with both project managers and project team members from five different cases within the IT-consulting and telecommunication industries. The interviewees all have between 4 and 13 years of experience in project work. The sample consists of 10 individuals, five project managers and five project team members, and their companies  all base operations on multiple simultaneous  projects. Issues like incidents emerged from content analysis and stem rather from the respondents’ choice of topics in the open-ended interviews than specific questions. |
| FINDINGS | 1. The results of the regression analysis for the motivational factor intrinsic process and level of team development, considering only the cases in the sample population where the team score reflected a working group or pseudo. 2. The motivational factor instrumental against level of team development, considering only the cases in the sample population where the team score reflected a working group or pseudo team. | No support for the congruency hypothesis was found for democratic behavior, positive feedback, training and instruction, situation consideration, social support or autocratic behavior for the dependent variable of extrinsic motivation external regulation. | (1) valuable resources vanish, and the project does not get compensation;  (2) other organizational duties take more time or energy than expected. These could be for example organizational projects, quality and union work, administrative issues and so on;  (3) the project or oneself is betrayed, e.g. when promised resources are not assigned;  (4) design-loops go in circles, meaning that  people have to re-define tasks or goals, repeatedly;  (5)project-owner changes preferences; |